



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/843,661 | 04/26/2001 | Jun Ishihara | 15162/03540 | 9666 |
| 24367 | 7590 04/26/2004 | | EXAM | INER |
| SIDLEY AU | STIN BROWN & W | QI, ZHI QIANG | | |
| 717 NORTH HARWOOD | | | | |
| SUITE 3400 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| DALLAS TX 75201 | | | 2871 | |

DATE MAILED: 04/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | A 1: /: N | |
|---|---|---|
| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| Advisory Action | 09/843,661 | ISHIHARA ET AL. |
| , | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Mike Qi | 2871 |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the o | correspondence address |
| THE REPLY FILED 15 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to averial rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment whicl | ation. A proper reply to a |
| PERIOD FOR RE | PLY [check either a) or b)] | |
| a) | Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing | g date of the final rejection. |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officitimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C | If extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mail | unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be | ecause: | |
| (a) they raise new issues that would require further | er consideration and/or search (s | see NOTE below); |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b | elow); | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or | n better form for appeal by mate | rially reducing or simplifying the |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceling NOTE: | ng a corresponding number of fi | nally rejected claims. |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject | ion(s): | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | be allowable if submitted in a se | eparate, timely filed amendment |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See | | dered but does NOT place the |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | ause it is not directed SOLELY t | o issues which were newly |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 and 3-5</u> . | | , |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 6-46. | | Ĵ |
| 8.☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ appr | oved or b) disapproved by the | ne Examiner. |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen | nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | |
| 10. Other: | | \mathcal{M} |
| | | KENNETHPARKER |
| | | PRIMARY EXAMINER |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: According to the limitation written in the claim 1, the cited reference discloses about the polarization separation element with a diffration-grating substrate, and the secondary references disclose the thickness of about 1 mm, and the same linear expasion coefficients would prevent the color tone change. The arguments about the birefringent effect that does not described in the claim.